

1 RENE L. VALLADARES
2 Federal Public Defender
3 Nevada State Bar No. 11479
4 MARGARET W. LAMBROSE
5 Assistant Federal Public Defender
6 Nevada State Bar No. 11626
7 411 E. Bonneville, Ste. 250
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
9 (702) 388-6577/Phone
10 (702) 388-6261/Fax
11 Maggie_lambrose@fd.org

12 Attorney for Cemone Champagne Lewis

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

16 Plaintiff,

v.

17 CEMONE CHAMPAGNE LEWIS,

18 Defendant.

19 Case No. 2:18-cr-055-APG-GWF

20 **MOTION TO SUPPRESS¹**
(Evidentiary Hearing Requested)

21 Cemone Lewis, through his counsel, Assistant Federal Public Defender Margaret
22 Lambrose, requests the Court suppress all evidence and statements Las Vegas Metropolitan
23 Police Department (LVMPD) officers obtained from the unlawful search and seizure following
24 officers' traffic stop of Mr. Lewis on February 1, 2018.

25 LVMPD officers obtained the challenged evidence by violating Mr. Lewis's Fourth and
26 Fifth Amendment rights in several ways. First, the officers unjustifiably prolonged Mr. Lewis's
seizure and exceeded the scope of the traffic stop. The officers thus conducted a de facto arrest

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
55310
55311
55312
55313
55314
55315
55316
55317
55318
55319
55320
55321
55322
55323
55324
55325
55326
55327
55328
55329
55330
55331
55332
55333
55334
55335
55336
55337
55338
55339
55340
55341
55342
55343
55344
55345
55346
55347
55348
55349
55350
55351
55352
55353
55354
55355
55356
55357
55358
55359
55360
55361
55362
55363
55364
55365
55366
55367
55368
55369
55370
55371
55372
55373
55374
55375
55376
55377
55378
55379
55380
55381
55382
55383
55384
55385
55386
55387
55388
55389
55390
55391
55392
55393
55394
55395
55396
55397
55398
55399
553100
553101
553102
553103
553104
553105
553106
553107
553108
553109
553110
553111
553112
553113
553114
553115
553116
553117
553118
553119
553120
553121
553122
553123
553124
553125
553126
553127
553128
553129
553130
553131
553132
553133
553134
553135
553136
553137
553138
553139
553140
553141
553142
553143
553144
553145
553146
553147
553148
553149
553150
553151
553152
553153
553154
553155
553156
553157
553158
553159
553160
553161
553162
553163
553164
553165
553166
553167
553168
553169
553170
553171
553172
553173
553174
553175
553176
553177
553178
553179
553180
553181
553182
553183
553184
553185
553186
553187
553188
553189
553190
553191
553192
553193
553194
553195
553196
553197
553198
553199
553200
553201
553202
553203
553204
553205
553206
553207
553208
553209
553210
553211
553212
553213
553214
553215
553216
553217
553218
553219
553220
553221
553222
553223
553224
553225
553226
553227
553228
553229
553230
553231
553232
553233
553234
553235
553236
553237
553238
553239
553240
553241
553242
553243
553244
553245
553246
553247
553248
553249
553250
553251
553252
553253
553254
553255
553256
553257
553258
553259
553260
553261
553262
553263
553264
553265
553266
553267
553268
553269
553270
553271
553272
553273
553274
553275
553276
553277
553278
553279
553280
553281
553282
553283
553284
553285
553286
553287
553288
553289
553290
553291
553292
553293
553294
553295
553296
553297
553298
553299
553300
553301
553302
553303
553304
553305
553306
553307
553308
553309
553310
553311
553312
553313
553314
553315
553316
553317
553318
553319
553320
553321
553322
553323
553324
553325
553326
553327
553328
553329
553330
553331
553332
553333
553334
553335
553336
553337
553338
553339
553340
553341
553342
553343
553344
553345
553346
553347
553348
553349
553350
553351
553352
553353
553354
553355
553356
553357
553358
553359
553360
553361
553362
553363
553364
553365
553366
553367
553368
553369
553370
553371
553372
553373
553374
553375
553376
553377
553378
553379
553380
553381
553382
553383
553384
553385
553386
553387
553388
553389
553390
553391
553392
553393
553394
553395
553396
553397
553398
553399
553400
553401
553402
553403
553404
553405
553406
553407
553408
553409
553410
553411
553412
553413
553414
553415
553416
553417
553418
553419
553420
553421
553422
553423
553424
553425
553426
553427
553428
553429
553430
553431
553432
553433
553434
553435
553436
553437
553438
553439
553440
553441
553442
553443
553444
553445
553446
553447
553448
553449
553450
553451
553452
553453
553454
553455
553456
553457
553458
553459
553460
553461
553462
553463
553464
553465
553466
553467
553468
553469
553470
553471
553472
553473
553474
553475
553476
553477
553478
553479
553480
553481
553482
553483
553484
553485
553486
553487
553488
553489
553490
553491
553492
553493
553494
553495
553496
553497
553498
553499
553500
553501
553502
553503
553504
553505
553506
553507
553508
553509
553510
553511
553512
553513
553514
553515
553516
553517
553518
553519
553520
553521
553522
553523
553524
553525
553526
553527
553528
553529
553530
553531
553532
553533
553534
553535
553536
553537
553538
553539
553540
553541
553542
553543
553544
553545
553546
553547
553548
553549
553550
553551
553552
553553
553554
553555
553556
553557
553558
553559
553560
553561
553562
553563
553564
553565
553566
553567
553568
553569
553570
553571
553572
553573
553574
553575
553576
553577
553578
553579
553580
553581
553582
553583
553584
553585
553586
553587
553588
553589
553590
553591
553592
553593
553594
553595
553596
553597
553598
553599
553600
553601
553602
553603
553604
553605
553606
553607
553608
553609
553610
553611
553612
553613
553614
553615
553616
553617
553618
553619
553620
553621
553622
553623
553624
553625
553626
553627
553628
553629
553630
553631
553632
553633
553634
553635
553636
553637
553638
553639
553640
553641
553642
553643
553644
553645
553646
553647
553648
553649
553650
553651
553652
553653
553654
553655
553656
553657
553658
553659
553660
553661
553662
553663
553664
553665
553666
553667
553668
553669
553670
553671
553672
553673
553674
553675
553676
553677
553678
553679
553680
553681
553682
553683
553684
553685
553686
553687
553688
553689
553690
553691
553692
553693
553694
553695
553696
553697
553698
553699
553700
553701
553702
553703
553704
553705
553706
553707
553708
553709
553710
553711
553712
553713
553714
553715
553716
553717
553718
553719
553720
553721
553722
553723
553724
553725
553726
553727
553728
553729
553730
553731
553732
553733
553734
553735
553736
553737
553738
553739
5537340
5537341
5537342
5537343
5537344
5537345
5537346
5537347
5537348
5537349
5537350
5537351
5537352
5537353
5537354
5537355
5537356
5537357
5537358
5537359
55373510
55373511
55373512
55373513
55373514
55373515
55373516
55373517
55373518
55373519
55373520
55373521
55373522
55373523
55373524
55373525
55373526
55373527
55373528
55373529
55373530
55373531
55373532
55373533
55373534
55373535
55373536
55373537
55373538
55373539
55373540
55373541
55373542
55373543
55373544
55373545
55373546
55373547
55373548
55373549
55373550
55373551
55373552
55373553
55373554
55373555
55373556
55373557
55373558
55373559
55373560
55373561
55373562
55373563
55373564
55373565
55373566
55373567
55373568
55373569
55373570
55373571
55373572
55373573
55373574
55373575
55373576
55373577
55373578
55373579
55373580
55373581
55373582
55373583
55373584
55373585
55373586
55373587
55373588
55373589
55373590
55373591
55373592
55373593
55373594
55373595
55373596
55373597
55373598
55373599
553735100
553735101
553735102
553735103
553735104
553735105
553735106
553735107
553735108
553735109
553735110
553735111
553735112
553735113
553735114
553735115
553735116
553735117
553735118
553735119
553735120
553735121
553735122
553735123
553735124
553735125
553735126
553735127
553735128
553735129
553735130
553735131
553735132
553735133
553735134
553735135
553735136
553735137
553735138
553735139
553735140
553735141
553735142
553735143
553735144
553735145
553735146
553735147
553735148
553735149
553735150
553735151
553735152
553735153
553735154
553735155
553735156
553735157
553735158
553735159
553735160
553735161
553735162
553735163
553735164
553735165
553735166
553735167
553735168
553735169
553735170
553735171
553735172
553735173
553735174
553735175
553735176
553735177

1 of Mr. Lewis without probable cause to do so. Second, Officer Deavers conducted an
2 unreasonable frisk of Mr. Lewis. Third, officers unlawfully searched Mr. Lewis's car. Fourth,
3 officers failed to *Mirandize* Mr. Lewis prior to interrogating him. But for these multiple
4 constitutional violations, officers would not have discovered the gun or obtained Mr. Lewis's
5 statements about the gun. For these reasons, all physical and testimonial evidence in this case
6 must be suppressed as fruit of the poisonous tree.

7 Dated this 19th day of July, 2018.

8 RENE L. VALLADARES
9 Federal Public Defender

10 By: /s/ Margaret Lambrose
11 MARGARET LAMBROSE
12 Assistant Federal Public Defender
13 Attorney for Cemone Champagne Lewis

Memorandum of Points and Authorities

Introduction

“You *stupid motherfucker*” . . . “I hope you *fuckin’ rot in hell* you *piece of shit*” . . . “you know what, *fuck you*” . . . “you’re as *dumb as they come*” . . . “bye, have fun in *prison, bitch*.” Imagine police officers screaming these obscenities at you after being stopped for a minor parking infraction. Imagine officers forcing you out of your car for that parking infraction, frisking and handcuffing you against a police car. Imagine standing there, humiliated, after an officer subjects you to a strip search and puts his hands down your pants and into your underwear behind your groin. And, imagine all of this happening on the side of a busy street, during rush hour traffic, with cars driving by and people walking past.

Cemone Lewis did not have to imagine this. That is what happened to him on February 1, 2018, when LVMPD officers repeatedly violated his constitutional rights.

On the late afternoon of February 1, 2018, LVMPD officers stopped Mr. Lewis as he drove on Harmon Lane in Las Vegas. Officers allegedly stopped Mr. Lewis due to a parking infraction that occurred when Mr. Lewis was parked in a handicap space at an apartment complex. When the officers stopped Mr. Lewis, he immediately presented them with his driver's license and vehicle documents. The officers took the license and vehicle documents from Mr. Lewis, but tossed them into the patrol car without making any effort to issue a traffic ticket. Instead of issuing the ticket, the officers demanded that Mr. Lewis exit his car. Mr. Lewis repeatedly questioned why he was being required to get out of his car for a parking infraction. He received no answers.

At that point, members of LVMPD's Convention Center Area Command (CCAC) arrived. One of the officers drew his weapon on Mr. Lewis and screamed at him to exit his car. At the same time, another officer opened the driver's side door to Mr. Lewis's car. Mr. Lewis immediately got out of his car without incident. Yet, officers pushed Mr. Lewis against his car, handcuffed and frisked him, and placed him against the hood of a squad car.

Instead of taking any action to issue Mr. Lewis a traffic citation, for sixteen minutes LVMPD officers searched his car, rummaging for evidence of a crime. During that time, other officers also interrogated Mr. Lewis without *Mirandizing* him and repeatedly searched him. While officers questioned Mr. Lewis and searched his car, they also muted their body worn cameras so the cameras would not record officers' investigation and conduct.

After illegally interrogating Mr. Lewis, searching his car – including unlocking and searching his glove box—and repeatedly searching Mr. Lewis, one of the officers conducted what amounted to a strip search. One officer placed his hands down Mr. Lewis's pants, into his underwear and behind his groin area where a handgun was located.

Sixteen minutes after the initial traffic stop, with at least six officers on the scene, an officer began screaming, cursing, and degrading Mr. Lewis.

It was not until over two hours after the initial traffic stop that Mr. Lewis received his *Miranda* warnings.

LVMPD officers' conduct violated Mr. Lewis's Fourth Amendment and Fifth Amendment rights, and all evidence tainted by the officers' unlawful seizure and search must be suppressed. Mr. Lewis seeks to suppress the gun, bullets, DNA, all other tangible and testimonial evidence stemming from the illegal seizure and search, as well as any fruits of the evidence officers unlawfully obtained.

Factual and Procedural History²

On February 1, 2018, at approximately 4:30 p.m., LVMPD Officer E. Nahum was driving a marked police car in Las Vegas. Exhibit A, Arrest Report, Bates 012. While on

² The facts presented here are based on the discovery provided by the government. Mr. Lewis asserts these facts for purposes of argument to support his argument regarding officers' violation of his constitutional rights and to show factual issues exist as to whether the officers violated Mr. Lewis's constitutional rights when gathering evidence. However, Mr. Lewis does not concede any of the factual allegations and reserves the right to challenge and supplement the evidence at the requested evidentiary hearing.

1 patrol, Nahum claimed he saw a silver Infinity M45 parked in a handicap space at an apartment
 2 complex. *Id.* Nahum further claimed that he was going to issue the driver, later identified as
 3 Cemone Lewis, a parking violation but Mr. Lewis drove away before Nahum had a chance to
 4 do so. *Id.* Nahum followed Mr. Lewis to the intersection of Harmon Ave. and Koval Lane and
 5 turned on his siren. Nahum Body Worn Camera, Exhibit B at :01- :30. Mr. Lewis complied
 6 with the officer's commands and pulled over the car. Exhibit B at :01- :30; see also Deavers
 7 Body Worn Camera, Exhibit C at :01 – 15.

8 At that point, Nahum approached Mr. Lewis's car and advised he stopped Lewis for a
 9 parking infraction. Exhibit B at :55. Mr. Lewis had his driver's license and vehicle documents
 10 ready to present to the officers. *Id.* at 1:05-1:15. Officer Deavers took Mr. Lewis's license and
 11 vehicle documents from Nahum and threw them onto the front seat of the patrol vehicle instead
 12 of writing a citation for the parking violation. Exhibit C at 1:48 to 1:56.

13 After Mr. Lewis gave his license and vehicle documents to the officers, Nahum asked
 14 Mr. Lewis to roll down his back window so that Deavers could look into the car. Exhibit B at
 15 1:10 – 1:20. Mr. Lewis complied and rolled his back window down. *Id.* Nahum then asked Mr.
 16 Lewis to exit his car. *Id.* at 1:40. Mr. Lewis asked why he needed to exit the car and stated that,
 17 as he had done nothing wrong, he was not going to exit the vehicle. *Id.* at 1:40 – 1:50. Nahum
 18 told Mr. Lewis that he needed to exit the car because, "now you're making me nervous." *Id.* at
 19 1:40 – 1:50. Nahum then called for backup. *Id.* at 1:50 – 2:00. Officers from LVMPD CCAC
 20 unit then arrived. Officer O'Connell drew his weapon on Mr. Lewis and demanded he exit the
 21 car. Exhibit E, Gower Body Worn Camera at :30-:50. At that point, Nahum opened Mr.
 22 Lewis's driver's side door, and Mr. Lewis exited the vehicle without incident. Exhibit C at 3:27-
 23 4:00.

24 After Nahum opened the driver's side door, Deavers immediately handcuffed and
 25 frisked Mr. Lewis as he stepped out of the car. Exhibit B at 3:35 – 3:40. No weapons or
 26 contraband was found during that frisk and at no point did Mr. Lewis resist the officers. *Id.*

1 After handcuffing Mr. Lewis, Deavers placed him against the hood of the police car and frisked
2 him again. Exhibit C at 4:12 – 4:55. Deavers also asked Mr. Lewis if he had ‘anything illegal
3 on him.’ Exhibit C at 4:30. After Deavers conducted a full pat down search of Mr. Lewis, he
4 asked another officer if there was “anything in there” referring to Mr. Lewis’s car. *Id* at 4:48.
5 Officer O’Connell also asked Mr. Lewis if he had anything in the car. Exhibit E at 6:45 to 7:00.
6 During this time, the officers never informed Mr. Lewis that he was not under arrest, nor did
7 the officers read Mr. Lewis his *Miranda* warnings.

8 After seven minutes into the traffic stop, none of the officers had written Mr. Lewis a
9 traffic ticket for the alleged parking violation. *Id*.

10 While the six officers on the scene continued questioning Mr. Lewis and searching his
11 car, Nahum conducted various database checks on Mr. Lewis and Officer Gower conducted a
12 “field interview.” Exhibit E at 2:20 – 4:20, Exhibit E 10:00 – 11:16; *see also* Exhibit B at 5:00-
13 5:26. Gower questioned Mr. Lewis about who he “gang bangs with,” and asked Mr. Lewis if
14 he was a felon. Exhibit E at 2:20 - 4:20. Gower also questioned Mr. Lewis about who he was
15 visiting in the Harbor Island, where that person’s apartment was located, and the friend’s name
16 who he was visiting. Exhibit E at 5:10 – 5:40. Mr. Lewis informed the officer he was visiting
17 a female friend of his who is a nurse. *Id*. Nahum also questioned Mr. Lewis about what he was
18 doing at the Harbor Island Apartments, how long he had been in town, where he permanently
19 resides, and where he received mail. Exhibit B at 5:00 – 7:00. Gower asked Mr. Lewis
20 questions about the color of his eyes and how he normally styles his hair; he also asked for Mr.
21 Lewis’s phone number. Exhibit E at 8:10 – 12:00. While Gower questioned Mr. Lewis,
22 Deavers searched his jacket and pants pockets. Exhibit E at 8:05-9:00.

1 During his database search, Nahum pulled up a CCAC bulletin regarding Mr. Lewis.
 2 Nahum then began discussing the bulletin with Officer Baily. Exhibit B at 6:50 – 7:07.³ Nahum
 3 told Baily, “we saw [Lewis] when he was over there at the Harbor Island and he was parked in
 4 the handicap so we were like eh. . . .” *Id.* At that point in officers’ conversation the audio cut
 5 off because Nahum muted his body camera. *Id.* Nahum left his body camera on mute for the
 6 next eleven minutes. *Id.* at 7:07 – 18:30.

7 After thirteen minutes into the traffic stop, none of the six officers had taken any action
 8 to write Mr. Lewis a citation for the alleged parking violation. *Id.*

9 While searching Mr. Lewis’s car, Officer O’Connell unlocked the glove box and
 10 searched it. Exhibit D at 2:30 to 4:00. One of the officers found marketing packages and a
 11 guest pass from apartment complexes in the car and proclaimed, “there you go, this establishes
 12 him being here longer than 48 hours.” Exhibit D at 4:40 - 4:47. The officers also searched the
 13 car’s center console, under the seats, under the floor mats and the trunk. Exhibit G, Jeong Body
 14 Worn Camera at 8:00 – 12:00. While searching Mr. Lewis’s car and questioning Mr. Lewis,
 15 the officers continued muting their body cameras for extended periods.⁴ *See e.g.* Exhibit C at
 16 5:20 to 10:18.

17

18 ³ Counsel for the defense requested that the government provide a copy of the CCAC
 19 bulletin. However, the government did not provide it.

20 ⁴ In the arrest report, Nahum alleged that once Mr. Lewis was out of his car, Nahum
 21 determined through a record check that Mr. Lewis had previously been issued a trespass citation
 22 in January 2018. *See Exhibit A, Bates 012.* Due to the citation, Nahum apparently contacted
 23 Detective Bragandi who informed Nahum that Mr. Lewis was “currently in violation of 179C
 24 requirements” for failing to register as a felon within 48 hours of being in Las Vegas. *Id.* Nahum’s arrest report further alleged that based on his conversation with Bragandi, Mr. Lewis
 25 was then placed under arrest for the violation and searched incident to the arrest. *Id.* However,
 26 that account of events is inconsistent with the bodycamera footage that shows the officers
 questioning Mr. Lewis about his residence and searching his car for almost sixteen minutes
 before Deavers searched Mr. Lewis and located the gun. Thus, an evidentiary hearing is
 necessary to develop the accurate timeline of events.

1 Sixteen minutes into the traffic stop, the six officers still had not written Mr. Lewis a
 2 citation for the alleged parking violation. Exhibit C at :00 - 16:00.

3 After Gower questioned Mr. Lewis for approximately ten minutes, Deavers searched
 4 Mr. Lewis again for a fourth time. Exhibit E at 13:13 – 14:20. During this search, Deavers
 5 grabbed the outside of Mr. Lewis's groin area and Deavers and Gower repeatedly asked Mr.
 6 Lewis "what he had in there." *Id.* Mr. Lewis repeatedly stated that he did not have anything. *Id.*
 7 Deavers eventually put his hands down Mr. Lewis's pants and into his underwear, locating a
 8 handgun behind Mr. Lewis's groin. Exhibit D at 13:15-13:42. At this point, Gower began
 9 screaming and cursing at Mr. Lewis, "what the fuck?" . . . "you know what, fuck you" . . . "you
 10 stupid motherfucker" . . . "I hope you fuckin' rot in hell you piece of shit" . . . "you're as dumb
 11 as they come" . . . "bye, have fun in prison, bitch."⁵ *Id.* Officer Jeong then called Mr. Lewis
 12 a motherfucker as Deavers placed him into the patrol vehicle. Exhibit G at 12:15-12:30.

13 Apart from the gun registered to Mr. Lewis's girlfriend, officers did not find any other
 14 weapons or contraband in Mr. Lewis's car or on him.

15 According to the police report, Detective Brigandi and Detective Schnuelle read Mr.
 16 Lewis his *Miranda* warnings at approximately 6:30 p.m., two hours after the stop. *See* Exhibit
 17 A, Bates 012. Mr. Lewis allegedly responded with a verbal, "Mmm hmm" when Brigandi
 18 asked if Mr. Lewis understood his rights.⁶ Brigandi then apparently interrogated Mr. Lewis for
 19 two and a half hours, during which he made statements about the gun being registered to his
 20 girlfriend. Exhibit F, Voluntary Statement, Bates 33-58.

21

22 ⁵ When Gower was done with his tirade, he muted the audio on his body worn camera.
 23 Exhibit E at 14:35.

24 ⁶ The transcript of the voluntary statement that the government disclosed to the defense
 25 does not provide the date or the time that the interrogation took place. *See* Exhibit F, Voluntary
 26 Statement, Bates 033. The only information the defense received regarding the time of the
 interrogation was from Nahum's arrest report. However, from the transcript of the statement it
 appears that the interrogation concluded at 9:00pm. Exhibit F, Bates 058. A hearing is
 necessary to develop an accurate timeline.

1 Officers ultimately booked Mr. Lewis in the Clark County Detention Center at 1:04
 2 a.m.—nine hours after Nahum and Deavers stopped him for the parking violation. Exhibit H,
 3 Booking Voucher, Bates 061. He was charged with convicted felon failure to register, carry and
 4 conceal a weapon without a permit, possession of a firearm by a prohibited person, and parking
 5 in a handicap space without a placard. *Id.*

6 After being released from the Clark County Detention Center, Mr. Lewis was arrested
 7 by federal marshals and charged with a single count of felon in possession of a firearm under
 8 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(1) and 942(a)(2). He has been in federal custody since March 5, 2018.

9 **Legal Argument**

10 **A. Officers Subjected Mr. Lewis and His Car to Warrantless Seizures and
 11 Searches, All of Which Are Presumptively Unreasonable.**

12 **1. The government bears the burden of proving Mr. Lewis's
 13 warrantless seizure and search falls within an exception to the
 14 Fourth Amendment's warrant requirement.**

15 “The Fourth Amendment provides in relevant part that ‘[t]he right of the people to be
 16 secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures,
 17 shall not be violated.’” *United States v. Jones*, 132 S. Ct. 945, 949 (2012) (quoting U.S. Const.
 18 amend. IV). Mr. Lewis's body plainly falls within the protection of the Fourth Amendment, as
 19 does his car. *See id.* (“It is beyond dispute that a vehicle is an ‘effect’ as that term is used in
 20 the Amendment.”); *United States v. Thomas*, 447 F.3d 1191, 1197 (9th Cir. 2006) (“We have
 21 previously held that the owner of an automobile has a legitimate expectation of privacy in the
 22 car, and therefore has standing to object to an unconstitutional search.”).

23 Police seize an individual within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment “when a law
 24 enforcement officer, through coercion, physical force, or a show of authority, in some way
 25 restricts the liberty of [that] person.” *United States v. Washington*, 387 F.3d 1060, 1068 (9th
 26 Cir. 2004) (internal quotation omitted). A person's liberty is restrained when, taking into
 27 consideration “all of the circumstances surrounding the encounter, the police conduct would

1 have communicated to a reasonable person that he was not at liberty to ignore the police
 2 presence and go about his business.” *Id.* (quoting *Florida v. Bostick*, 501 U.S. 429, 437 (1991));
 3 *see also Brendlin v. California*, 551 U.S. 249, 251 (2007) (“When a police officer makes a
 4 traffic stop, the driver of the car is seized within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment.”).

5 A “search” occurs, for Fourth Amendment purposes, “when an expectation of privacy
 6 that society is prepared to consider reasonable is infringed.” *United States v. Jacobsen*, 466
 7 U.S. 109, 113 (1984). All of the LVMPD officers’ searches and seizures here took place without
 8 a warrant. It is well-established that any search or seizure made without a warrant is *per se*
 9 unreasonable—subject only to a few specifically established and well-delineated exceptions.
 10 *United States v. Scott*, 705 F.3d 410, 416 (9th Cir. 2012); *United States v. Hawkins*, 249 F.3d
 11 867, 872 (9th Cir. 2001).

12 “The burden of proving that a warrantless search or seizure falls within an exception to
 13 the warrant requirement is on the government.” *Scott*, 705 F.3d at 416 (*citing Hawkins*, 249
 14 F.3d at 872); *see also United States v. Johnson*, 936 F.3d 1082, 1084 (9th Cir. 1991) (“The
 15 government bears the burden of justifying a warrantless search.”); *United States v. Delgadillo-*
 16 *Velasquez*, 856 F.2d 1292, 1295 (9th Cir. 1988) (“The government bears the burden to show
 17 that a warrantless seizure does not violate the Fourth Amendment.”). Furthermore, the
 18 government must prove the lawfulness of a warrantless seizure or search by a preponderance
 19 of the evidence. *See United States v. Vasey*, 834 F.2d 782, 785 (9th Cir. 1987) (“The
 20 government must prove the existence of an exception to the Fourth Amendment Warrant
 21 Requirement by a preponderance of the evidence.”).

22 Accordingly, it is the government’s burden to show that each of the following
 23 presumptively unreasonable seizures and searches in this case were lawful:

24

- 25 • the officers’ prolonged and unreasonable detention of Mr. Lewis beyond the
 duration of the initial traffic stop;

26

- the search of Mr. Lewis’s car at the scene;

1 • the multiple frisks of Mr. Lewis after officers ordered him out of his car;

2 • Gower's strip search/undergarment search of Mr. Lewis.

3 There is little doubt the government will be unable to carry its burden with respect to
 4 these warrantless seizures and searches. Accordingly, all evidence officers obtained as a result
 5 of these Fourth Amendment violations must be suppressed as "fruit of the poisonous tree." *See*
 6 *Wong Sun v. United States*, 371 U.S. 471, 488 (1963).

7 **2. Officers arrested Mr. Lewis without probable cause because officers' actions unjustifiably prolonged Mr. Lewis's seizure and exceeded the scope of the traffic stop.**

8 Officers' initial traffic stop went from an investigatory detention to a full-blown arrest
 9 without probable cause when the officers handcuffed and repeatedly frisked Mr. Lewis, placed
 10 him on the hood of the squad car, searched his car, and interrogated him for approximately
 11 sixteen minutes prior conducting a strip search. Generally, a detention "involves no more than
 12 a brief stop, interrogation and, under proper circumstances, a brief check for weapons." *United*
 13 *States v. Miles*, 247 F.3d 1009, 1012 (9th Cir. 2001). "If the stop proceeds beyond these
 14 limitations, an arrest occurs, which requires probable cause." *Id.*

15 It is well settled that a "seizure that is lawful at its inception can violate the Fourth
 16 Amendment if its manner of execution unreasonably infringes interests protected by the
 17 Constitution." *Illinois v. Caballes*, 543 U.S. 405, 407 (2005). "The scope of the detention must
 18 be carefully tailored to its underlying justification." *Florida v. Royer*, 460 U.S. 491, 500 (1983).
 19 Indeed, the "length and scope of a detention [must] be 'strictly tied to and justified by the
 20 circumstances which rendered its initiation permissible.'" *Pierce v. Multnomah Cnty.*, 76 F.3d
 21 1032, 1040 (9th Cir. 1996) (quoting *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 16 (1968)) (emphasis added).
 22 Importantly it is the government's burden to establish that the stop was "sufficiently limited in
 23 scope and duration." *Florida v. Royer*, 460 U.S. 491, 500 (1983).

1 Tasks not related to the mission of the stop “are therefore unlawful if they add time to
 2 the stop, and are not otherwise supported by independent reasonable suspicion of wrongdoing.”
 3 *United States v. Evans*, 786 F.3d 779, 785-86 (9th Cir. 2015). In *Evans*, the officer
 4 impermissibly extended a traffic stop initiated for a minor traffic violation when he ran a felon
 5 registration check and permitted a dog sniff. *Id.* at 784-86. Checking the felon registration was
 6 unrelated to the mission of the stop and was a measure aimed at detecting evidence of ordinary
 7 criminal wrongdoing. *Id.* Importantly, the *Evans* court noted that safety precautions taken to
 8 facilitate investigation of other crimes do not stem from the mission of the stop itself and
 9 therefore cannot justify its extension. *Id.* at 786-87. The Ninth Circuit concluded, “this kind
 10 of a traffic stop for an extended period of time was an unlawful seizure... [in] violation of
 11 federal law.” *Id.* at 784. Because the individual was “seized beyond the amount of time that’s
 12 reasonable under our constitution,” the search was “an unlawful one.” *Id.*

13 The *Evans* court found, “[t]he ex-felon registration check, unlike the vehicle records or
 14 warrants checks, was wholly unrelated to [the officer’s] ‘mission’ of ‘ensuring that vehicles on
 15 the road are operated safely and responsibly.’” *Evans*, 786 F.3d at 786 (quoting *Caballes*, 543
 16 U.S. at 408). “Rather, it was ‘a measure aimed at ‘detect[ing] evidence of ordinary criminal
 17 wrongdoing.’” *Evans*, 786 F.3d at 786. “That the ex-felon registration check occurred before
 18 the officer issued a ticket is immaterial; rather, the critical question is whether the check
 19 prolongs—*i.e.*, adds time to—the stop.” *Id.* at 786 (citation omitted).

20 The Ninth Circuit recognized in *Evans* that an officer may need to take certain
 21 precautions to complete his traffic mission safely, but the ex-felon registration check “in no
 22 way advanced officer safety.” *Evans*, 786 F.3d at 787. Safety “precautions” undertaken in order
 23 to facilitate the investigation of other crimes do not stem from the mission of the stop itself and
 24 therefore cannot justify extending a traffic stop. *Id.*

25 The officers’ actions here were nearly identical to the officers’ actions in *Evans*. Here,
 26 like *Evans*, the officers extended the traffic stop to find evidence of criminal activity that was

1 unrelated to the mission of the stop, i.e. to issue a traffic ticket. Officers here unnecessarily
2 added sixteen minutes to the stop by running database checks related to the CCAC bulletin,
3 searching Mr. Lewis's car and his person, and conducting an extended interview, including
4 eliciting incriminating information without *Mirandizing* Mr. Lewis.

5 These actions were unrelated to the purpose of the stop: to cite a driver for a minor non-
6 moving traffic violation. Each step officers took added unnecessary and unlawful time to the
7 length of Mr. Lewis's detention. This unjustified prolonged stop exceeded the scope of the
8 traffic stop and violated Mr. Lewis's Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable
9 seizure. As detailed below, officers impermissibly extended the stop in several ways.

10 **a. Nahum added time to the stop by ordering Mr. Lewis out of
11 the car, cuffing him, and placing him against the squad car.**

12 Although an officer may order a passenger out of a stopped car for officer safety, the
13 authority to do so only lasts as long as the lawfulness of the stop itself. "Unlike a general
14 interest in criminal enforcement, . . . the government's officer safety interest stems from the
15 mission of the stop itself." *Rodriguez v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 1609, 1615 (2015). "On-
16 scene investigation into other crimes, however, detours from that mission." *Id.* Accordingly,
17 "an officer making a traffic stop may order passengers to get out of the car *pending completion*
18 *of the stop.*" *Maryland v. Wilson*, 519 U.S. 408, 415 (1997) (emphasis added).

19 Here, Nahum could have completed his mission for this traffic stop as soon as Mr.
20 Lewis provided his license and vehicle documents. However, instead of making any effort to
21 issue Mr. Lewis a ticket and release him from his seized status, Nahum unnecessarily prolonged
22 the stop by ordering Mr. Lewis out of the vehicle, handcuffing him, and placing him against the
23 police squad car while the officers conducted investigation unrelated to the stop. *See Evans*,
24 786 F.3d at 786.

b. Officers added time to the stop by illegally searching the car.

Officers' actions when searching Mr. Lewis's car also unreasonably extended the length of the stop. Conducting a full search of the car, including the locked glove box, was not a "negligibly burdensome precaution" meant to complete the officers' mission safely. *Evans*, 786 F.3d at 787. Such a search was completely unrelated to the mission of writing a ticket for a parking violation and ensuring the safety of automobiles on the road. *Id.* at 786-87. There was simply no justification for extending the stop in this manner.

c. Officers added time to the stop by running database checks and conducting a prolonged field interview.

The seizure for a traffic stop remains lawful only “so long as [unrelated] inquiries do not measurably extend the duration of the stop.” *Arizona v. Johnson*, 555 U.S. 323, 333 (2009). Under *Rodriguez*, 135 S. Ct. 1609, and its progeny, Nahum was permitted to ask Mr. Lewis for identification, run his name to check for warrants, and ask questions so long as those questions did not prolong the stop. However, there was no reason for Nahum to run any database checks unrelated to officer safety—those checks were wholly unrelated to LVMPD’s mission of ensuring vehicles on the road are operated safely and responsibly, and “in no way advanced officer safety.” *Evans*, 786 F.3d at 786, 787.

Gower also extended the time of the stop by questioning Mr. Lewis about his eye color, his hairstyle, his phone number, his work as a musician, his criminal history, and who he was visiting at the apartment complex. These questions were unrelated to the traffic stop, unrelated to officer safety, and unreasonably added time to the stop.

The ancillary database searches pertaining to the CCAC bulletin were run simply to detect evidence of criminal wrongdoing and impermissibly added time to the stop. In essence, the officers unlawfully prolonged the length and exceeded the scope of the traffic stop. Instead of attempting to take any steps necessary to the mission of the traffic stop, i.e. writing a citation, the officers instead ordered Mr. Lewis out of his car at gunpoint, frisked him repeatedly, and

1 handcuffed him. They then moved him to the hood of one of the patrol vehicles. There they
 2 searched Mr. Lewis's car looking for evidence of a crime while questioning him about matters
 3 wholly unrelated to the stop or officer safety.

4 For these reasons, it is clear that the detention, which went well beyond the duration of
 5 the initial traffic stop, was prolonged and unreasonable.

6 **3. Deavers did not possess specific, articulable facts that Mr. Lewis was
 7 armed and presently dangerous to justify subjecting Mr. Lewis to
 8 multiple frisks and reaching into his underwear and underneath his
 9 groin area.**

10 “The Fourth Amendment guarantees ‘the right of the people to be secure in their
 11 persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.’” *United*
 12 *States v. Scott*, 705 F.3d 410, 416 (9th Cir. 2012) (quoting U.S. Const. amend. IV) (brackets
 13 omitted). Under *Terry*, the “Fourth Amendment permits brief investigative stops when a law
 14 enforcement officer has reasonable suspicion that the person stopped is engaged in criminal
 15 activity.” *United States v. Williams*, 846 F.3d 303, 308 (9th Cir. 2017). “This means the officer
 16 must have reasonable suspicion ‘the person apprehended is committing or has committed a
 17 criminal offense.’” *Thomas v. Dillard*, 818 F.3d 864, 874-75 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Johnson*,
 18 555 U.S. at 326).

19 In a traffic-stop setting, police may detain an automobile and its occupants pending
 20 inquiry into a vehicular violation based on reasonable suspicion. *Johnson*, 555 U.S. at 327.
 21 “To justify a pat-down of the driver or a passenger during a traffic stop, however, just as in the
 22 case of a pedestrian reasonably suspected of criminal activity, the police must harbor reasonable
 23 suspicion that the person subjected to the frisk is armed and dangerous.” *Id.*

24 “A frisk for weapons is a serious intrusion upon the sanctity of the person, which may
 25 inflict great indignity and arouse strong resentment, and it is not to be undertaken lightly.”
 26 *Thomas*, 818 F.3d at 876 (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, reasonable suspicion

1 supporting a *Terry*-type stop of a vehicle does not necessarily give police reasonable suspicion
2 to pat down the driver:

3 [W]hereas a *Terry* stop is justified by reasonable suspicion that
4 criminal activity may be afoot, a frisk of a person for weapons
5 requires reasonable suspicion that a suspect is armed and
6 presently dangerous to the officer or to others. A lawful frisk
does not always flow from a justified stop. Rather, each element,
the stop and the frisk, must be analyzed separately; the
reasonableness of each must be independently determined.

7 *Thomas*, 818 F.3d at 876 (brackets, internal quotation marks, and citations omitted).

8 “Reasonable suspicion is an objective standard, asking whether a reasonably prudent
9 person would have been warranted in believing the suspect was armed and thus presented a
10 threat to the officer’s safety while he was investigating his suspicious behavior.” *Thomas*, 818
11 F.3d at 876 (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted). “To establish reasonable suspicion
12 a suspect is armed and dangerous, thereby justifying a frisk, the police officer must be able to
13 point to specific and articulable facts which, taken together with rational inferences from those
14 facts, reasonably warrant that intrusion.” *Id.* In other words, a determination of reasonable
15 suspicion must be grounded in hard facts:

16 A mere inchoate and unparticularized suspicion or hunch that a
17 person is armed and dangerous does not establish reasonable
18 suspicion, and circumstances suggesting only that a suspect
would be dangerous *if* armed are insufficient. There must be
adequate reason to believe the suspect *is* armed.

19 *Id.* (italicized emphasis in original) (internal quotation marks omitted).

20 Here, the government cannot provide articulable, particularized facts to establish a
21 reasonable suspicion that Mr. Lewis, while handcuffed, was presently armed and dangerous
22 when Deavers patted him down at least four separate times. Mr. Lewis committed a minor,
23 non-moving traffic violation that prompted the car stop. He immediately provided Nahum with
24 his vehicle documents and driver’s license. When Mr. Lewis asked why Nahum wanted him
25 to get out of the car, Nahum responded, “now you are making me nervous.” This general and
26 conclusory statement regarding “officer safety” does not provide specific, articulable,

1 particularized facts that support a reasonable suspicion that Mr. Lewis was armed and
 2 dangerous. *Ramirez v. City of Buena Park*, 560 F.3d 1012, 1022 (9th Cir. 2009) (holding pat-
 3 down not justified where officer merely made “conclusory reference” to “officer safety”).

4 **4. Deavers invasively searched Mr. Lewis’s body, exceeding the
 5 constitutionally permissible bounds of a *Terry* frisk.**

6 In addition to prolonging the stop and conducting multiple *Terry* frisks, Deavers
 7 exceeded *Terry*’s permissible scope by putting his hands down Mr. Lewis’s pants and into his
 8 underwear despite not feeling anything during the previous frisks.

9 A *Terry* frisk must be “confined in scope to an intrusion reasonably designed to
 10 discover” hidden weapons. *Terry*, 392 U.S. at 29. An officer should begin a *Terry* search by
 11 “pat [ting] down a suspect’s outer clothing and feel[ing for] an object whose contour or mass
 12 makes its identity immediately apparent.” *Minnesota v. Dickerson*, 508 U.S. 366, 375 (1993).
 13 A search exceeds the proper scope if “the incriminating character of [an item is] not
 14 immediately apparent” but is discovered “only as a result of a further search.” *Id.* at 379.

15 Accordingly, to legitimize a search underneath a suspect’s clothing, an officer must
 16 reasonably believe, based on the frisk, that weapons could still be present. *See, e.g., I.E.V.*, 705
 17 F.3d at 440-41; *United States v. Miles*, 247 F.3d 1009, 1014 (9th Cir. 2001) (emphasizing that
 18 *Dickerson’s* “immediately apparent” rule applies once the officer reasonably determines that he
 19 has not felt a weapon).

20 Thus, setting aside for a moment the illegality of Mr. Lewis’s arrest at the scene of the
 21 traffic stop, officers exceeded the permissible scope of a search incident to arrest. The “‘full
 22 search’ authorized by [the search-incident-to-arrest cases] [i]s limited to a pat-down and an
 23 examination of the arrestee’s pockets, and d[oes] not extend to a strip search or bodily
 24 intrusion.” *Fuller v. M.G. Jewelry*, 950 F.2d 1437, 1446 (9th Cir. 1991). The Ninth Circuit’s
 25 search-incident-to-arrest cases “simply d[o] not contemplate the significantly greater intrusions
 26 involved in strip . . . searches.” *Id.*; *see also Illinois v. Lafayette*, 462 U.S. 640, 645 (1983)

1 (“[T]he interests supporting a search incident to arrest would hardly justify disrobing an arrestee
 2 on the street.”)

3 Deavers subjected Mr. Lewis to a strip search by reaching down into his pants and then
 4 reaching inside his underwear.⁷ When an officer instructs a suspect “to drop his trousers and
 5 pull down his underwear,” he commits an invasion “more intrusive than [the] pat-down search”
 6 permitted by the search-incident-to-arrest exception. *United States v. Vance*, 62 F.3d 1152,
 7 1156 (9th Cir. 1995); *see also Edgerly v. City & Cty. of S.F.*, 599 F.3d 946, 947 (9th Cir. 2010)
 8 (“[V]isually inspecting an arrestee’s naked body, even without a visual examination of body
 9 cavities, constitutes a strip search.”). The Ninth Circuit held in *Edgerly* that the jury could
 10 conclude an officer engaged in a strip search where he “required [the defendant] to arrange his
 11 clothing so as to permit a visual inspection of his undergarments, by asking him to pull his pants
 12 down to his ankles,” and then “placed his finger within [the defendant’s] boxers and kind of
 13 just looked around. *Id.* at 958. Deavers’s repeated prodding and manipulation of Mr. Lewis’s
 14 underwear and groin area were at least as invasive as the police conduct in *Edgerly*. The “strip
 15 search” exceeded a “pat-down” and therefore violated Mr. Lewis’s Fourth Amendment rights.
 16 *Fuller*, 950 F.2d at 1446.

17

18 **5. This Court should suppress all fruits of the unconstitutional
 prolonged seizure and illegal arrest.**

19 Evidence police seize as a result of a Fourth Amendment violation must be suppressed.
 20 *See, e.g., Wong Sun*, 371 U.S. 471. This exclusionary rule prohibits the government from
 21 introducing evidence directly obtained in violation of the defendant’s constitutional rights.
 22

23

24 ⁷ This search took place while Mr. Lewis was handcuffed. Having already used
 25 significant force to secure the scene for safety purposes, the officers cannot leverage the safety
 rationale into a justification for a full-scale search. The search exceeded the “strictly
 circumscribed” limits of *Terry. Miles*, 247 F.3d at 1015.

1 *Murray v. United States*, 487 U.S. 533, 536 (1988) (internal citations omitted). Furthermore,
 2 [i]t is fundamental that the exclusionary rule extends beyond evidence directly obtained in
 3 violation of the Fourth Amendment to the ‘fruit of the poisonous tree.’” *United States v. Johns*,
 4 891 F.2d 243, 245 (9th Cir. 1989). Thus, “the exclusionary rule also prohibits the introduction
 5 of derivative evidence, both tangible and testimonial, that is the product of the primary
 6 evidence, or that is otherwise acquired as an indirect result of the unlawful seizure. . . .”
 7 *Murray*, 487 U.S. at 536-37.

8 “The focus is on the causal connection between the illegality and the evidence; and, the
 9 burden of showing admissibility rests on the prosecution.” *Johns*, 891 F.2d at 245. The test is
 10 whether “the illegal activity tends to significantly direct the investigation to the evidence in
 11 question.” *Id.* If there is a Fourth Amendment violation, the government must demonstrate
 12 there was a “break in the chain of events sufficient to refute the inference that” the evidence
 13 obtained was a product of the illegal stop. *United States v. Twilley*, 222 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th
 14 Cir. 2000)

15 Given the unconstitutionally the prolonged detention (leading to a de facto arrest) and
 16 illegal search of Mr. Lewis’s car and his person, this Court should suppress all evidence officers
 17 directly obtained by violating Mr. Lewis’s Fourth Amendment rights. This includes the gun
 18 seized Mr. Lewis’s groin area, all of Mr. Lewis’s statements, the DNA officers collected from
 19 Mr. Lewis, all evidence tainted by the constitutional violations, and fruits thereof.

20 **6. Fifth Amendment Violation**

21 *Miranda* warnings are necessary when police interrogate a suspect in custody.
 22 *Thompson v. Keohane*, 516 U.S. 99, 102 (1995). Custodial interrogation occurs when officers
 23 initiate questioning after a person is taken into custody or deprived of his freedom. *United States*
 24 *v. Butler*, 249 F.3d 1094, 1098 (9th Cir. 2001) (citing *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 444
 25 (1966)). In determining whether a suspect was in custody for *Miranda* purposes, courts
 26 determine whether there was a formal arrest or restraint on freedom of movement to the degree

1 associated with formal arrest. *Stansbury v. California*, 511 U.S. 318, 322 (1994) (quoting
 2 *California v. Beheler*, 463 U.S. 1121, 1125 (1983)). The analysis considers whether a
 3 reasonable person in the suspect's position would have felt deprived of his freedom of action
 4 in any significant way, such that he would not have felt free to terminate the interrogation.”
 5 *United States v. Craighead*, 539 F.3d 1073, 1082 (9th Cir. 2008).

6 In addition to being in custody, the individual must also be subject to interrogation to
 7 trigger the *Miranda* requirement. *Rhode Island v. Innis*, 446 U.S. 291, 300 (1980). Interrogation
 8 means questioning or “its functional equivalent,” including “words or actions on the part of the
 9 police (other than those normally attendant to arrest and custody) that the police should know
 10 are reasonably likely to elicit an incriminating response from the suspect.” *Innis*, 446 U.S. 291
 11 at 301. An “incriminating response” is any response, whether inculpatory or exculpatory, that
 12 the prosecution may seek to introduce at trial. *Id.* at 302.

13 Whether the questioning constitutes an interrogation is an objective test focusing on the
 14 perception of the defendant. The officer's subjective intent in asking the questions is relevant,
 15 but not determinative. *See, e.g., United States v. LaPierre*, 998 F.2d 1460, n.6 (9th Cir. 1993);
 16 *Innis*, 446 U.S. at 301-02.

17 Here, Neham and Deavers ordered Mr. Lewis out of the car, handcuffed him and ordered
 18 him to stand at the hood of the patrol car. At that point Mr. Lewis was arrested or at a minimum
 19 deprived for his movement to the degree associated with an arrest. *Miranda* warnings were
 20 required before any officer could initiate questioning from that point forward.

21 While officers unlawfully searched the car, Nehum and Gowers asked a series of
 22 questions of Mr. Lewis likely to elicit an incriminating response. Ex. B at 15:12-15:30 (“Do
 23 you have anything on you? . . . Is there anything in the car? Are you a felon? . . . How long
 24 have you been in Las Vegas? . . . Where do you live? . . . Where do you receive mail? . . . Who
 25 do you gang bang with? . . . What gang are you in? . . .). Questions about whether Mr. Lewis
 26 had anything on him or whether there was anything in the car clearly elicited an incriminating

1 response. Furthermore, questions about whether Mr. Lewis was a felon, how long he had been
 2 in Las Vegas, and where he currently lived were also intended to elicit an incriminating
 3 response as felons are required to register within 48 hours of being in Nevada and failure to do
 4 so is a misdemeanor offense.⁸

5 Here, the government cannot prove Mr. Lewis received adequate *Miranda* warnings and
 6 validly waived his rights *before* officers interrogated him. As evidenced by LVMPD's own
 7 reports, Brigandi did not *Mirandize* Mr. Lewis until around 6:30 p.m two hours after he was
 8 formally arrested. *See Exhibit A, Bates 012.*⁹ When Brigandi finally read Mr. Lewis his
 9 *Miranda* warnings at Mr. Lewis allegedly responded with a verbal, "Mmm hmm."

10 Accordingly, an evidentiary hearing is necessary to determine when Mr. Lewis was
 11 Mirandized and whether Mr. Lewis made a voluntary, knowing, and intelligent waiver of his
 12 rights. The government bears the great burden of proving *Miranda* warnings are sufficient for
 13 a defendant to make a voluntary, knowing and intelligent waiver of his *Miranda* rights. *United*
 14 *States v. Garibay*, 143 F.3d 534, 536 (9th Cir. 1998). "The government's burden to make such a
 15 showing is great, and the court will indulge every reasonable presumption against waiver of
 16 fundamental constitutional rights." *Garibay*, 143 F.3d at 537.

17 An evidentiary hearing is also necessary for the Court to determine a basic timeline of
 18 events. The government's discovery fails to explain why Mr. Lewis was not Mirandized for at
 19 least two hours after his arrest or why he was held at the scene from 4:30 p.m. until
 20 approximately 1:00 a.m.

21
 22
 23
 24 ⁸ See NRS 179C.100.
 25
 26 ⁹ It is unclear what time the formal interrogation took place as the transcript from Mr. Lewis's statement does not provide the date or time when it began. However, it apparently ended at 9:00 p.m. A hearing is necessary to determine the timeline of the interrogation.

Conclusion

For these reasons, Mr. Lewis respectfully requests this Court grant the Motion to Suppress.

Dated this 19th day of July, 2018.

RENE L. VALLADARES
Federal Public Defender

By: /s/ Margaret Lambrose
MARGARET LAMBROSE
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Attorney for Cemone Champagne Lewis

Index of Exhibits

A	LVMPD Arrest Report, 02/01/2018
B	Bodycam Video of Officer Neham
C	Bodycam Video of Officer Deavers
D	Bodycam Video of Officer O'Connell
E	Bodycam Video of Officer Gowers
F	Transcript of Voluntary Statement, 02/01/2018
G	Bodycam Video of Officer Jeong
H	Booking Voucher, 02/02/2018

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that she is an employee of the Federal Public Defender for the District of Nevada and is a person of such age and discretion as to be competent to serve papers.

That on July 19, 2018, she served an electronic copy of the above and foregoing **MOTION TO SUPPRESS** by electronic service (ECF) to the person named below:

DAYLE ELIESON
United States Attorney
PHILLIP N. SMITH, JR.
Assistant United States Attorney
501 Las Vegas Blvd. South
Suite 1100
Las Vegas, NV 89101

/s/ *Stephanie Young*
Employee of the Federal Public Defender